

to continue to rise over the next 6 months. Inflation isn't an abstract concept. Americans across the country are feeling the pinch every day at the grocery store, the gas pump, and everywhere else as they buy goods to support their families.

The Consumer Price Index reported earlier this year that inflation soared to a record level of 7 percent in 2021, and it only continues to grow with Democrats' wasteful spending sprees.

The underlying bill we are considering today just continues that dangerous pattern of reckless spending. Instead of focusing on the targeted bipartisan investments in basic research that would help America excel in competition against China, the underlying bill is filled with partisan slush fund spending.

We need to address the inflation crisis, and it should be top of mind whenever we consider massive spending bills.

This is why I strongly support this amendment, which directs the National Science Foundation to commission a study on the impacts of inflation on the American people, our international competitiveness, our underserved and rural communities, and our future generations.

As the U.S. economy rebounds from COVID-19, with the national debt at more than \$30 trillion, and inflationary risks rising daily, this straightforward amendment is sensible, necessary, and timely.

I want to thank my colleague for her work on this important amendment. I urge a "yes" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the colleague's concern about the impact of inflation on our constituents, especially those who are already living on the margins. If anything, this should be a wake-up call to us how far too many Americans are living on the margins.

But I will not digress further. This amendment, while well-intentioned, I am sure, is misplaced.

Without question, NSF funds important economic research. In fact, they have funded nearly all recipients in the history of the Nobel Prize in economics. So, surely, there are NSF-funded economists who study some of these questions.

However, this amendment is highly flawed. If the intent is for NSF to fund researchers through the traditional grant-making process, this amendment circumvents NSF's gold standard merit-review process. In that process, the researchers themselves propose the important questions, which are then reviewed by their peers.

If the intent, on the other hand, is for NSF to commission the National Academies or some other organization to

carry out this study, the focus is entirely inappropriate.

NSF, and sometimes Congress, do call on the National Academies, or another respected organization, to carry out studies on particular topics, but those studies are notable for some key criteria.

First, they are not carrying out original research or data analysis. They are summarizing the current scientific understanding, as published in the peer-reviewed literature.

And second, they are providing recommendations that guide NSF's own decisionmaking in what research topics are highest priority to advance to the frontiers of science, and the mechanisms to facilitate that research.

This study meets neither of those essential criteria, not even close. Perhaps the Bureau of Economic Analysis has some of these data already and can brief the gentlewoman.

But this is simply inappropriate for the National Science Foundation, and I must oppose this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, in closing, I want to reiterate my thanks to Representative KIM for her work on the amendment. I urge a "yes" vote to my colleagues, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the previous question is ordered on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Mrs. BICE).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment number 171 will not be offered.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4521 is postponed.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1531

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TORRES of California) at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

#### BIOECONOMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4521) to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that amendment No. 179 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 184 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 184 printed in part D of House Report 117-241.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of title VI of division D, add the following:

#### SEC. 30613. WITHDRAWAL OF THE UNITED STATES FROM THE UNITED NATIONS FRAMEWORK CONVENTION ON CLIMATE CHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall—

(1) not later than 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide written notification to the Depository of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, done at Rio de Janeiro, June 3-14, 1992, of the withdrawal of the United States from the Convention effective on the date that is one year after the date of receipt by the Depository of such notification of withdrawal in accordance with Article 25 of the Convention; and

(2) on the effective date referred to in paragraph (1), withdraw the United States from the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

(b) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—No funds authorized or appropriated by any Act may be used to support, directly or indirectly, any efforts on the part of any United States Government official to take steps to carry out the obligations of the United States under the United Nations Framework on Climate Change on or after the effective date referred to in subsection (a)(1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to please join me in protecting American workers by terminating U.S. participation in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The UNFCCC charges signatories to work to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that will prevent dangerous human interference with the climate system.

The institution's mission to prevent dangerous human interference with the climate system precludes the body from investigating potential natural causes of climate variation and binds member states to act in the interest of human safety even in the face of scientific uncertainty.